are sufficient within the space of seven years, to | satisfy or pay such ju igment or other liens."

Mr. Chambers renewed the motion which he gave on the seventh of February, that he should, on Monday week, move to reconsider the vote of the Convention on the amendment offered by Mr. DORSEY, and adopted by the Convention, as an amendment to the thirty-third article.

On the day on which the bill should be taken up, Mr. C. said, he proposed to press the ques-

tion.

Mr. Cristield said, he rose to give notice of his intention to move a reconsideration of the vote just taken, to abolish impris nment for debt, with the view of amending and perfecting that measure. Imprisonment for debt in this State was already nearly nominal, and rarely existed practically, ex ept with the consent of the ceptor, or in cases of frauds; but if the people desired to abolish it entirely, he was willing. He wished, however, to throw such guards about the abolition, as were necessary, to prevent frauds, and secure the honest appropriation of all the debtors property for the payment of his With that view he should move a recreditors. consideration at the proper time. His purpose was not to defeat the abolition of imprisonment for debt; but in relieving debtors he wished the

rights of creditors to be protected.

Mr. PRESSTMAN said that when the proposition for the abolition of imprisonment for debt was originally is troduced by him from the legislative committee, he did not suppose that if the principle was recognized, it would, in any manner, prevent any gentieman from proposing additional sections, looking to the punishment of fraud- in the subject matter of the contract, or in providing any change or alteration in the present system of insorvency, to meet the altered state of things, whereby the assets of insolvents might be distributed. But why, sir, is there any necessity for the reco sideration of the naked principle which this Convention has adopted by a vote so decisive, as any abandonment of the position is hardly to be expected. The gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Crisfield,) may now, or at any time, propose to engraft upon the Constitution provisions controlling the whole subject, or requiring that the Legislature shall, at their first session after the adoption of the new Constitation, enact such laws as will carry out his general design, which he, (Mr. P.,) understood not to be, in any degree, hostile to the general principle, except so far as to meet cases of f aud. It would be almost impossible in a Constitution, to define specifically what should be deemed fraud. This was a work of detail and ought properly to be left to the wisdom of the Legislature.

Mr. Chambers moved a reconsideration. He had voted with the minority, against adopting the provision in its present unqualified and un-conditional form. It might be very proper to adopt the principle of the provision, but it required guards and mod fications, which could not be enacted by the I egislature under the broad and sweeping terms of the article as now adopted. In fact, there could not be said to ex-

voluntary imprisonment for debt, except where fraud was estab ished; and in that case he did not think it wise to dispense with it. Having been denied the opportunity of assigning his reason, previously to the vote, he had moved the reconsideration to enable him to do so in the fewest words possible and new withdrew his motion.

The PRESIDENT, pro tem , (Mr. Spencer,) stated

that all this debate had been out of order.

Some conversation followed.

Mr. Bowie, (for the purpose of making an explanation,) moved that the Convention reconsider the vote on the motion postponing the considera-

tion of the legislative report.

Mr. Bowie thought there was no occasion for a reconsideration of the voe just taken on the abolishment of imprisonment for debt. could not see the necessity for any amendment. He rejoiced that such a provision had been engrafted in the Constitution, and he hoped the friends of the measure would not place it in jeopardy by consenting to a re-consideration. It is said that he provision is too general in its terms, and that some limitations might be inserted which would provide against the perpetration of fraud by dishonest debtors; but he thought, that such limitations would be altogether out of place, if inserted in the Constitution. Such was not the case in those States where imprisonment for debt had been abolished. The general principle alone was inserted in their Constitution. The Constitution ought not to be encumbered with such matters of detail as was contempl ted by the motion of the gentleman from Somerset, (Mr. Crisfield.) It was competent, at all times, for the Legislature to provide by law for the punishment of trauds. They are as fully competent to perform this task, as the Convention would be, and he thought it much more proper that they should do it. Let the broad principle be inserted in the Constitution, and we shall then have discharged our duty; and let us leave it to the Legislature to make all necessary rules to guard against frauds He hoped, therefore, that the provision would stand as it now is, and that no re-consideration of it would prevail.

Mr. Bowie then withdrew the motion.

Mr. JENIFER, by unanimous consent, made the following report from committee No. 14:

Art. 1. No person holding an office or appointment under the Constitution or laws of this State, (mere members of the legal profession not being regarded as such office-holder,) no member of the General Assembly of Maryland, no person holding any office or appointment thereunder, or under either branch thereof shall under any promise or expectation of a fee, reward, or compensation of any nature or kind, for so doing, advocate before the General Assembly or either branch thereof, or any member of the same a claim of any other person, against the Sate; or with such legislative body, or any of its members, use advise, recommendation, or persuasion for the allowance or payment of any such claim, or the adoption of any legislative action for that purpose; and any person herein offending shall be guilty of a high misdemeanor, and ist, at this time, in our State, such a thing as in- on conviction thereof, on indictment in a court